

REMARKS

The present response is intended to be fully responsive to the rejection raised in the Office action, and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Further, the Applicants do not acquiesce to any portion of the Office Action not particularly addressed. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

In the Office action, the Office noted that claims 1 are pending and rejected. Applicants amend claims 9 and 10. Applicants have not introduced any new matter by way of the foregoing amendments.

In view of the above amendments and the following discussion, the Applicants submit that none of the claims now pending in the application are anticipated obvious under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 103. Thus, Applicants believe that all of these claims are now in condition for allowance.

REJECTION

The Office rejected claims 1-6, 8-15, 18, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,225,322 ("*Folmsbee*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,380,275 ("*Srinivasan*") and claims 21 and 23-25 in view of *Folmsbee* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,287,508 ("*Hejna*"). This rejection is traversed.

The Office indicated the combination of *Folmsbee* and *Srinivasan* discloses all the elements of claims 1, 6 and 11. Applicants disagree and further submits that *Folmsbee*, *Srinivasan* and *Hejna* teach away from one another.

More specifically, *Folmsbee* discloses "the satellites must broadcast the same cryptographic keys to many set-top boxes simultaneously," and "the key has two separate functions which must be coded into the key when it is produced." Whereas, *Srinivasan* and *Hejna* teach away from "coding into the key when it is produced."

Accordingly, it is Applicant's opinion that of *Folmsbee*, *Srinivasan* and *Hejna*, alone and in combination, do not suggest or show a motivation for modifying the reference or to combine the reference teachings. In addition, it is Applicant's opinion that there is no evidence in any of the prior art that shows a "reasonable expectation of

success” in combining the references. Thus, it is Applicant’s belief that a prima facie case of obviousness has not been provided.

Claims 2-5, 7-10, 12-19 and 21-25 depend from claim 1, 6, 11 or 20 and this contain all the limitations recited in their respective claims. Hence Applicant submit that *Folmsbee*, *Srinivasan* and *Hejna*, alone and in combination, do not deem claims 1-25 obvious.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, the Applicants submit that none of the claims presently in the application are obvious under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §103. Consequently, the Applicants believe that all these claims are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

If, however, the Office believes that any unresolved issues still exist or if, in the opinion of the Office, a telephone conference would expedite passing the present application to issue, the Office is invited to call the undersigned attorney directly at 972-917-4365 or the office of the undersigned attorney at 972-917-5651 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 30, 2009

By: /MIRNA ABYAD/
MIRNA ABYAD
Registration No. 58,615
Texas Instruments Incorporated
P.O. Box 655474, M/S 3999
Dallas, TX 75265
Telephone: (972) 917-4365
E-mail: mabyad@ti.com